Development of a website support intervention for families after sudden cardiac death

Laura Yeates BSc (hons) Grad Dip Gen Couns [1-3], Amy Baker BSc, MGenCouns[1], Karen Gardner BA, MPH, PhD, Natalie Stewart MGenCouns[1], Laura Catto MGenCouns [1], Judy Do BPsych (Hons)[1], Felicity Leslie BAppSc (MRT) [1], Christopher Semsarian MBBS, PhD, MPH[2,3,6], Belinda Gray MBBS PhD[2,3], Alison McEwen GradDipGenCouns, PhD[5], Leesa Adlard MA ClinPsych, D.Litt et Phil Psych[3], Jodie Ingles GradDipGenCouns, PhD, MPH[1-3]

[1]Garvan Institute of Medical Research, and UNSW Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

[2]Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

[3]Department of Cardiology, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney, NSW Australia

[4]Academic Unit of General Practice, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia

[5]Graduate School of Health, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

[6]Agnes Ginges Centre for Molecular Cardiology at Centenary Institute, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Word count: 3995 (max 4000)

Conflicts of interest: JI receives research grant support from Bristol Myers Squibb unrelated to this work. All remaining authors have nothing to disclose.

Corresponding author:
Laura Yeates
The Garvan Institute of Medical Research
Address: 384 Victoria Street, Darlinghurst NSW 2010
Email: l.yeates@garvan.org.au Twitter: @laurayeates1

HIGHLIGHTS

Sudden cardiac death is a devastating complication of many genetic heart diseases.

COPE-SCD is an intervention developed to support families after sudden cardiac death.

COPE-SCD includes a website covering a range of topics to help families after sudden cardiac death.

Website acceptability was assessed using a theoretical framework of acceptability.

ABSTRACT

Objective: To develop content for the website component of COPE-SCD: an online community supporting families after sudden cardiac death (SCD) and assess its acceptability.

Methods: Based on topics from codesign focus groups, website content was drafted, and readability of language assessed. SCD family members were recruited from the Genetic Heart Disease Clinic, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney. Demographic and psychological measures were collected at baseline. 'Think aloud' interviews were conducted to assess the website with questions mapped to theoretical framework of acceptability.

Results: Fourteen webpages were created under six menu options. Topics range from information on SCD, genetic testing, grief and loss and family stories. Average Flesch-Kincaid school grade reading score was 8.75. Six individuals participated in a 'think aloud' analysis and interview. Fifty percent were female, and all university educated. Median time since death was three years (range 1-5 years). Participants provided feedback about aesthetics, technical issues, and content. Interview responses were mapped to the theoretical framework of acceptability.

Conclusion: Participants found the website a helpful resource, and acceptable when considering the theoretical framework of acceptability.

Practice implications: This website fills a current gap in the care of families after SCD; more work is needed to assess effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION

Sudden cardiac death (SCD) is a devastating complication of many genetic heart diseases and often occurs without warning, leaving families at a loss as to why their loved one has passed away. Known or suspected genetic heart diseases such as inherited cardiomyopathies or arrhythmia syndromes cause the majority of deaths in those aged under 35 years [1]. The clinical heterogeneity of these conditions means that a person may be asymptomatic and undiagnosed prior to their death. SCD leaves families grappling with the uncertainty of why their family member passed away and whether other family members are at risk of a similar event [2]. A previous needs analysis of parents who had experienced the SCD of a child identified “medical information and support” as a highly endorsed need (71%) yet remained unmet for 32% of participants [3]. To meet the need for information and support, we used stakeholder codesign focus groups to develop COPE-SCD: an online community supporting families after SCD [4]. The intervention comprised two parts: a website and a series of four, online support sessions. This study focuses on development and acceptability of the website.

The internet is a widely utilised source of health information for Australians [5]. However, access to information represents only one of many hurdles individuals face when seeking health information. In recent years, the concept of ‘health literacy’ has come to the forefront in a research context. Health literacy refers to a person’s ability and motivation to access, interpret and act on health information that might concern everyday health, disease prevention or maintaining or improving quality of life [6]. Although multifaceted, a core component of health literacy is readability of the information. Over time, many readability scores have been developed to aid authors in making their information accessible to those with low reading levels. A popular and well-established method is the Flesch-Kincaid grade level score [7]. It is a widely used and established tool which gives an indication of the school grade reading level needed to read a given text [7, 8]. In general, it is recommended

that authors aim for their health information to be readable at a Grade 8 level (13-15 year olds) [9].

Implementation science has become necessary in medical research to effectively incorporate new health interventions, such as websites, into clinical care. Before considering implementation of a developed intervention, acceptability of the intervention must be assessed [10]. One widely used [11-13] framework that can prompt and guide the researcher is the theoretical framework of acceptability developed by Sekhon et al. [14]. This framework outlines seven constructs of acceptability to be considered when deciding whether an intervention is acceptable to participants and/or deliverers. The constructs of this framework and their meaning are outlined in Table 1.

The theoretical framework of acceptability illustrates the complexity of determining whether an intervention is acceptable to the user. Tensions can exist between constructs, for example, a participant may like the intervention in general (Affective attitude), but the perceived amount of effort required to participate may be too great (Burden). In this scenario the participant may not consider the intervention acceptable.

We hypothesise a website that provides health information and information on grief and loss to families who have experienced SCD will be acceptable to these users. Therefore, the aim of this study was to develop content for a website aimed at helping families affected by SCD in the young and measure its acceptability through a ‘think aloud’ analysis.

METHODS

Participants

Participants were recruited through the Genetic Heart Disease Clinic, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney, Australia. Purposive sampling was used to obtain demographic diversity with respect to sex, age, and relationship to the deceased. Participants were invited to participate in a study to evaluate a new website aimed at families who had experienced the SCD of a family member. Eight potential participants were invited by an experienced cardiac genetic counsellor (LY), who works within this team. We included those aged ≥18 years, with a first-degree relative (including spouse) having experienced SCD. Participants required self-determined English-speaking skills sufficient to participate in a website review and interview.

Participants who consented completed a baseline questionnaire including demographic questions, the Health Literacy Questionnaire (HLQ) [15], the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale short form (DASS-21) [16], and the Impact of Events Scale (IES-revised) [17]. The HLQ is a 44-item, nine domain questionnaire measuring the complex components that contribute to a person's health literacy [15]. The DASS-21 is a 21-item scale that gives three scores for depression, anxiety and stress. Each score is classified into one of five categories: normal, mild, moderate, severe and extremely severe [16]. A table outlining the DASS-21 cut-offs for each subscale classification can be found in Supplementary Material Part A. The IES-revised is a 22-item scale that measures post-traumatic stress symptoms and provides subscale scores for avoidance, intrusion and hyperarousal [17]. A total score of ≥24 indicates a person is experiencing post-traumatic stress symptoms.

Postcode was collected to enable calculation of the Australian Bureau of Statistics Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage (IRSAD) [18], the Index of Education and Occupation (IEO) [18] as well as determine the Remoteness Area [19]. These three scores use Australian census data to measure levels of advantage and disadvantage based

on factors such as the number of households in an area with low income or unskilled occupants (IRSAD), education and occupation of a given area (IEO) and distance to services (remoteness area). Baseline questionnaire information was collected using REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted by Sydney Local Health District [20-21].

Website rationale

A website was selected as a key part of the COPE-SCD intervention during the intervention's codesign process [4]. Participants in the codesign focus groups suggested a website would be well placed to provide accurate information to families and healthcare professionals, including outlining clear referral pathways as well as providing a platform for peer support. The strength of a website is its accessibility by those rurally and regionally based, who often have trouble accessing current services which tend to be located in metropolitan centres. Although some websites exist internationally (https://www.c-r-y.org.uk/ and https://sads.org), they do not contain information that is local in nature such as coronial processes and referral to clinical services and therefore an Australian website was necessary. A website also allows a user to engage with it at the time and to the degree that suits them [4], as well as being easily shared with others. A further advantage of using a website is in the ease of updating content as necessary, thus providing a constant resource for family members without a heavy time burden placed on staff.

Website content development

Based on the topics raised in the codesign focus groups [4], an outline of the website menu was drafted by LY in discussion with the research team. First draft of the content was primarily written by LY with members of the research team contributing as required based on their clinical expertise. For example, clinical psychologist LA assisted with the first draft of the "grief and loss" and "coping" sections. Other experts in the team (cardiologists BG/CS and genetic counsellors) then reviewed pages relevant to their expertise. Once drafted, all content was reviewed by other genetic counsellors in the team (AB, NS, LC) to ensure

consistency of language. The Flesch-Kincaid Grade level score in Microsoft word was used to assess readability. Pages were also reviewed using the health literacy editor (https://shell.techlab.works/) which helps identify complex words and sentences within text [9].

Development of animated video content

The website included an animated video**.** The video aimed to give a general overview of SCD and repeat key information that would often be given in the first phone call with a family from a genetic heart disease clinic. The video was designed to be easily shared with extended family and friends of the deceased person. Key points of the script were developed by the research team whilst working with the professional animator (www.animateyour.science).

Website evaluation – 'think aloud' analysis

Participants underwent a 'think aloud' analysis to review the developed website. This qualitative research method asks participants to review content and 'think aloud' i.e., verbalise their thoughts while reviewing [22]. The 'think aloud' analysis was held over zoom using the share screen function and video and audio were recorded. Transcripts of the interviews were made from the audio recordings but were not made available to the participants for review due to ample opportunity to refine their thoughts throughout the interview. Video recordings were also reviewed to ensure feedback was attributed to the correct section of the website.

At the completion of the 'think aloud' analysis, participants were asked questions to further understand their thoughts regarding the website. To assess the acceptability of the website, the interview schedule was designed to address the seven constructs of theoretical framework of acceptability [14]. The full interview schedule can be found in Supplementary Material B. LY completed all 'think aloud' interviews and subsequent analyses. At the

completion of the interview, participants received an email invitation to complete the system usability scale [23]. This is a 10-item questionnaire that gives a score to rate usability of a given system. Although not a validated scale it was developed as a subjective measure of usability [23].

After completing three 'think aloud' interviews, de-identified feedback on each specific page of the website was collated in a spreadsheet. These were reviewed by two genetic counsellors in the research team (LY and AB), and adjustments to the website were made where practical. Where any discrepancy arose in whether to incorporate changes, these were discussed with the wider research team. An additional three 'think aloud' interviews were then completed and proposed adjustments collated and made following the same process.

Transcripts of all six interviews were reviewed to assess the website acceptability. Acceptability of the website was assessed using a deductive framework analysis whereby interview transcripts were reviewed and responses mapped to the theoretical framework of acceptability (Table 1). Similar approaches using the this framework have been previously reported [24]. Ethics approval for this project was granted through Sydney Local Health District, RPA Zone, protocol number X21-0284.

Results

Content development and readability

A website menu list of content was developed, which brought together similar topics under submenus for ease of navigation (Table 2). Written drafted content was assessed for readability using the Flesch-Kincaid grade level, aiming for a Grade 8 reading level. The mean overall score of the website was 8.75. Some pages were not assessed, namely those

that contained (1) clinic contact details, which are unable to be changed, and (2) the family stories page which will be regularly updated and readability assessed with each new story. Where pages scored higher than a Grade 8 level, content was reviewed and simplified. Pages with persistent high scores (e.g., Genetic testing, Flesch-Kincaid score = 9.9), had complicated but essential terms that increased the score e.g., 'forensic pathologist', 'post mortem' and 'genetic'. On these pages, a stylistic approach and vector pictures were used to break up the text and enhance understanding (Figure 1A). Interactive tools were also used to break text up and focus the reader on the most pertinent information. For example, rather than a list of definitions of the different types of inherited heart diseases, an interactive menu was created whereby website reviewers roll their cursor over a specific diagnosis to reveal a simplified definition (Figure 1B).

'Think aloud' analysis

Six of the eight invited participants agreed to participate in the 'think aloud' analysis and completed the demographic and baseline questionnaires. Two rounds of 'think aloud' analysis were conducted, each with three participants.

The demographics of the think aloud participants are shown in Table 3. The median age of the study participants was 39.5 years (range 29-62 years), 50% female and all had some level of university education. Fifty percent self-described as religious and two thirds were married. Two participants were widowed, and it was their spouse that suffered a SCD. Median time since death was three years. The majority of the cohort were of European background and lived in the top 50% of socio-economic advantage and disadvantage as described by the IRSAD score. When considering the remoteness area as developed by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, two thirds lived in "major cities of Australia" with the remaining living in "inner regional Australia" (Table 3). Median length of 'think aloud' and post review interview was 50 minutes, range 40-80mins.

The HLQ scores for the nine domains were calculated as per Osbourne et al., [15] and compared with the Australian mean for each domain [25]. Due to low sample size no statistical analyses were made.

Depression, anxiety, and stress scores were assessed using the DASS-21[16]. All participants had depression, anxiety scores and stress scores in the moderate, severe, or extremely severe range. All participants (100%) reported post-traumatic stress symptoms as measured by an Impact of Events Scale-Revised score over 24 [17].

Website feedback

Overall, participants liked the website, commenting about the value of the information and the range of topics it covered.

> *"I like the sort of equal emphasis given to both the aspects of sudden cardiac death as well as the grief and loss. Yeah. Part because they're both really important and um, equally pressing factors you have in your mind in a situation like that"*
> Participant 5

Participants gave general feedback about the aesthetics of the website, including colour schemes, font sizes and use of stock images. After feedback from the first round of 'think aloud' interviews, stock images were removed from the website as they were polarising for the participants with strong opinions in both directions regarding their appropriateness. These were replaced with simpler vector images, which were well received in the second round (Figure 2).

Other concerns participants raised included technical issues, problems with the menu, sections of the website that were missed or overlooked (e.g., video content). Participants also suggested additional content e.g., resources for speaking to children. Some participants

suggested additional video content. Three participants completed the system usability scale at the completion of the think aloud interview. All participants scored above 66 which is considered above average [26].

Mapping to acceptability framework

Interview questions were mapped to the theoretical framework of acceptability [14] to ensure all constructs of acceptability were considered. Example quotes for each construct are presented in Table 4. Here we will briefly consider each construct.

Affective attitude

Participants were asked to give general feedback on what they liked the most and the least about the website, taking into account both written information and the aesthetic. Overall, participants had a positive attitude towards the website (Table 4). Participant 3 highlighted the original dark tones and noted that some of the stock images “did not give a positive feeling about the website” (Table 4). Others noted that a lot of bright colours were used, for example “too much pink” (Participant 4), and therefore changes were made to the colour scheme to ensure balance between bright and dark tones.

Burden

Burden was explored by asking questions regarding the emotional burden of reading the information and the ease of navigating the website. Initially there were issues with the menu that were rectified after the first round of interviews. Participant 3 commented on the care that had been taken in writing the content, even though parts were hard to read.

> *“It wasn't too clinical, which I think is good. Um, it made me feel a little bit sad, but it felt like, like approachable or like there was a care, you could tell like, like people that care and then are trying to take the um, like I guess a really supportive approach in how they, think about these issues. So, I think that comes across.”* Participant 3

Ethicality

Closely related to the burden construct, ethicality seeks to understand if the intervention is a good fit with an individual's value system. All participants reported the website was not offensive or in contradiction with their value system. However, there was content they reported as "triggering" or hard to read:

> *"A lot of the stuff on cardiac death is always hard to read, but not because of the content, just because of what's happened"* Participant 5.

> *"I think any of the, um, stuff obviously makes people… uncomfortable. I mean that's the whole point. If you're reading it and you've lost someone… I think it does what it needs to in terms of providing where to go and find the information… you know, you're probably gonna be crying if you've just lost someone and you're reading it, but not due to the content"* Participant 1

Intervention coherence

This construct examines the extent to which the participant understands the intervention and how it works. Participants felt this would be very helpful to families after SCD particularly in the early stages. One participant also noted that it would be helpful to share with family and friends to help explain the situation:

> "*this is, you know, what happened to [deceased]. Save all those, you know, awkward questions from people or you know, the rumours and everything*" Participant 6

Opportunity costs

Participants were asked about whether reviewing the website (as a consumer rather than research participant) was a good use of their time, noting that this would be the main cost to

engage with the intervention. All participants felt reviewing the website would be a good use of their time with one participant commenting:

> *"Yeah, I think it's helpful."* Participant 5

Perceived effectiveness

We examined the extent to which the intervention was perceived to achieve its purpose. Participants gave positive feedback about the website and found it particularly helpful that it covered the spectrum of information from causes of sudden cardiac death to issues around grief and loss (Table 4). One participant noted that the website would be particularly helpful:

> *"you've got some fantastic information in here that I think people will find very, very useful, particularly as if they're navigating this space for the first time"* Participant 3.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy considers the confidence that users can perform behaviours required. Given the popular and widespread use of websites, we focused questions to address self-efficacy around whether they could navigate around the website again and find specific information. Feedback concerning changes to the menu and titles of different pages were applied to clarify ambiguity. In general, participants felt they could easily navigate the website again (Table 4). The final website can be viewed at www.copescd.org.au

Discussion and Conclusions

Based on content ideas from codesign focus groups, the website COPE-SCD: an online community supporting families affected by SCD in the young was developed. The website provides information on SCD in the young including genetic causes as well as information on general coping, both on an individual level and in the context of the wider family and community. The website contains written and video information, with consideration given to layout to improve readability. A 'think aloud' analysis was used to evaluate and improve the website and specifically understand its acceptability.

Implementation research suggests review of acceptability both in the early stages of intervention development as well as once it is integrated into use [10]. Perski and Short argue that acceptability should also be considered as part of a broader system that associates closely with user engagement and intervention effectiveness [27]. Theoretical frameworks aid researchers in their assessment of health interventions, as in this example, the multifactorial concepts of acceptability are considered, and the intervention adjusted if the construct is not met. In this project the framework was utilised to guide generation of the interview schedule questions. However, since the development of the protocol for this project, Sekhon et al have developed a standard questionnaire to assess the constructs of the original acceptability framework [28].

Readability of health information on websites continues to be less than ideal, with a previous study identifying the majority of Australian health information websites having an average Flesch-Kincaid Grade reading level of 10.54 [5]. Numerous scores have been developed to help authors assess readability in order to reduce information to a Grade 8 reading level but challenges with these remain. Some of the scores, like the widely used and available Flesch-Kincaid, have come under scrutiny due to the variability in scores depending on the tool used to calculate it e.g., Microsoft word vs online websites [29]. However, a recent study found that the Microsoft word calculation of the Flesch-Kincaid, as used in this study,

showed good agreement with the reference standard calculation [30]. A further consideration regarding readability scores for medical websites is that by their nature they often contain long, complex medical terms and therefore will score highly even if a simple definition of the word is provided. This is due to the basis of the formula for scores like the Flesch-Kincaid grade levels, which take into account the number of syllables per word. In an effort to cater to those with lower literacy levels, the COPE-SCD website utilised different tools to break up text and make it more accessible to the reader, which has been recommended by patient education checklists [31]. This included graphics and design features to draw attention to key points and reduce the amount of text on the page. Content was also produced in both written and video format, recognising that videos are generally helpful for those with low literacy and also for those for whom English is a second language [32-33].

The need for a website has been highlighted in our previous work which identified medical information and support as a gap in the care of families after SCD in the young [3]. Further supporting this, we reported families who had struggled to find appropriate information in the time period after the death, until they were referred to a speciality genetic heart disease clinic. This led to participants feeling alone and feeling the need to do their own research to find advice for themselves and other relatives, as well as to seek information on genetic testing [34]. COPE-SCD aims to fulfil these needs by providing information on causes of sudden death, possible genetic causes of SCD, the role of genetic testing and the importance of seeing a general practitioner to arrange referral.

McDonald et al. identified psychological support as a need of SCD families [3]. The COPE-SCD website aims to meet this psychological support in the way of general information on grief and loss with the aim to normalise common grief experiences and provide access to peer support. Psychological support has previously been identified as a gap among families who reported searching for peer support online. Although other bereavement and grief and loss support groups exist (e.g., Compassionate Friends), previous work has highlighted the

specific need for “shared experience” of SCD [35], recognising its unique differences from other causes of premature death, such as SCD onset without warning, the possibility of a genetic cause and no definitive cause of death [36-37]. In the COPE-SCD website our primary method of addressing peer support is in the “family stories” section of the website where families are invited to share their experience. In addition, the second part of the COPE-SCD intervention, the online sessions, focuses on peer support.

Limitations

Despite best efforts for diversity of research participants, our sample was homogenous with most being of European background and highly educated. This is reflective of our sample base as previously described [38]. Further examination of the website with other diverse groups is needed. The ‘think aloud’ analysis was based on interviews with six participants, this number is consistent with other studies using ‘think aloud’ methods to assess health interventions [22, 39].

Here we describe the development of the website component of the COPE-SCD support intervention. The website provides information in written and video format on both causes of SCD in young people and grief and loss. We also assessed the acceptability of the website using a ‘think aloud’ analysis which mapped interview questions to Sekhon’s theoretical framework of acceptability. Overall, participants found the website a helpful and important resource which they found acceptable when considering seven constructs of acceptability.

Practice implications

The COPE-SCD website is an acceptable resource for families affected by sudden cardiac death in the young. More work is needed to assess its effectiveness as it is implemented into clinical care.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Laura Yeates: conceptualisation, methodology, investigation, software, formal analysis, writing – original draft, writing-review and editing, visualisation, project administration, funding acquisition. **Amy Baker:** investigation, software, visualisation, writing-review and editing. **Karen Gardner:** conceptualisation, methodology, writing-review and editing. **Natalie Stewart:** investigation**,** writing-review and editing. **Laura Catto:** investigation**,** writing-review and editing**. Judy Do:** conceptualisation, methodology. **Felicity Leslie:** conceptualisation, methodology, writing-review and editing **Christopher Semsarian:** conceptualisation, methodology, resources, writing-review and editing, supervision **Belinda Gray:** resources, writing-review and editing **Alison McEwen:** conceptualisation, methodology, writing-review and editing, supervision. **Leesa Adlard:** conceptualisation, methodology, investigation, writing-review and editing, supervision **Jodie Ingles:** conceptualisation, methodology, investigation, writing-review and editing, supervision.

Acknowledgements

LY is the recipient of a co-funded National Heart Foundation of Australia/ National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) PhD Scholarship (#102568/#191351). CS is the recipient of a NHMRC Investigator Grant (#2016822) and a New South Wales Health Cardiovascular Disease Clinician Scientist Grant. JI is the recipient of a National Heart Foundation of Australia Future Leader Fellowship (#106732). BG is the recipient of a National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Early Career Fellowship (#1122330).

We confirm all patient/personal identifiers have been removed or disguised so the patient/person(s) described are not identifiable and cannot be identified through the details of the story.

References

[1] M. K. Stiles *et al.*, “2020 APHRS/HRS expert consensus statement on the investigation of decedents with sudden unexplained death and patients with sudden cardiac arrest, and of their families,” *J. Arrhythmia*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 481–534, 2021, doi: 10.1002/joa3.12449.

[2] J. Ingles, C. Spinks, L. Yeates, K. McGeechan, N. Kasparian, and C. Semsarian, “Posttraumatic Stress and Prolonged Grief After the Sudden Cardiac Death of a Young Relative,” *JAMA Intern. Med.*, vol. 176, no. 3, pp. 402–405, Mar. 2016, doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.7808.

[3] K. McDonald, L. Sharpe, L. Yeates, C. Semsarian, and J. Ingles, “Needs analysis of parents following sudden cardiac death in the young,” *Open Heart*, vol. 7, no. 2, p. e001120, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1136/openhrt-2019-001120.

[4] L. Yeates *et al.*, “Using codesign focus groups to develop an online COmmunity suPporting familiEs after Sudden Cardiac Death (COPE-SCD) in the young,” *BMJ Open*, vol. 12, no. 8, p. e053785, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-053785.

[5] C. Cheng and M. Dunn, “Health literacy and the Internet: a study on the readability of Australian online health information,” *Aust. N. Z. J. Public Health*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 309–314, 2015, doi: 10.1111/1753-6405.12341.

[6] K. Sørensen *et al.*, “Health literacy and public health: A systematic review and integration of definitions and models,” *BMC Public Health*, vol. 12, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Dec. 2012, doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-80.

[7] J. P. Kincaid, R. P. Fishburne, R. L. Rogers, and B. s. Chissom, “Deviation of new readability formulas (automated readbility index, FOG count and Flesch reading ease formula) for Navy enlisted personnel.,” Memphis, TN, USA, Navel Air Station: Research Branch Report No 8-75, 1975.

[8] N. Mcinnes and B. J. A. Haglund, “Readability of online health information: implications for health literacy,” *Inform. Health Soc. Care*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 173–189, Dec. 2011, doi: 10.3109/17538157.2010.542529.

[9] J. Ayre *et al.*, “Multiple Automated Health Literacy Assessments of Written Health Information: Development of the SHeLL (Sydney Health Literacy Lab) Health Literacy Editor v1,” *JMIR Form. Res.*, vol. 7, p. e40645, Feb. 2023, doi: 10.2196/40645.

[10] M. Klaic *et al.*, “Implementability of healthcare interventions: an overview of reviews and development of a conceptual framework,” *Implement. Sci.*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 10, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1186/s13012-021-01171-7.

[11] T. Coffey, E. Duncan, H. Morgan, and K. Gillies, “Developing strategies to address disparities in retention communication during the consent discussion: development of a behavioural intervention,” *Trials*, vol. 24, no. 1, p. 296, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.1186/s13063-023-07268-2.

[12] S. Turnbull, N. E. Walsh, and A. J. Moore, “Adaptation and Implementation of a Shared Decision-Making Tool From One Health Context to Another: Partnership Approach Using Mixed Methods,” *J. Med. Internet Res.*, vol. 25, p. e42551, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.2196/42551.

[13] C. Paynter, C. McDonald, D. Story, and J. J. Francis, “Application of the theoretical framework of acceptability in a surgical setting: Theoretical and methodological insights,” *Br. J. Health Psychol.*, vol. n/a, no. n/a, doi: 10.1111/bjhp.12677.

[14] M. Sekhon, M. Cartwright, and J. J. Francis, “Acceptability of healthcare interventions: an overview of reviews and development of a theoretical framework,” *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 88, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1186/s12913-017-2031-8.

[15] R. H. Osborne, R. W. Batterham, G. R. Elsworth, M. Hawkins, and R. Buchbinder, “The grounded psychometric development and initial validation of the Health Literacy Questionnaire (HLQ),” *BMC Public Health*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 658, Jul. 2013, doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-13-658.

[16] S. Lovibond and P. Lovibond, *Manual for Depression anxiety stress scale*, Second edition. Sydney, Australia, 1995.
[17] D. Weiss and C. Marmar, “The impact of event scale - revised,” in *Assessing psychological trauma and PTSD.*, New York, USA: Guilford Press, 1997, pp. 399–411.
[18] “Socio-economic indexes for areas (SEIFA) Australia,” Australian Bureau of Statistics. [Online]. Available: https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-communities/socio-economic-indexes-areas-seifa-australia/latest-release#index-of-relative-socio-economic-advantage-and-disadvantage-irsad-
[19] “Remoteness areas,” Australian Bureau of Statistics. [Online]. Available: https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/standards/australian-statistical-geography-standard-asgs-edition-3/jul2021-jun2026/remoteness-structure/remoteness-areas
[20] P. A. Harris, R. Taylor, R. Thielke, J. Payne, N. Gonzalez, and J. G. Conde, “Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support,” *J. Biomed. Inform.*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 377–381, Apr. 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010.
[21] P. A. Harris *et al.*, “The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners,” *J. Biomed. Inform.*, vol. 95, p. 103208, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208.
[22] C. Bonner *et al.*, “I Don’t Believe It, But I’d Better Do Something About It: Patient Experiences of Online Heart Age Risk Calculators,” *J. Med. Internet Res.*, vol. 16, no. 5, p. e3190, May 2014, doi: 10.2196/jmir.3190.
[23] J. Brooke, “SUS: A ‘quick and dirty’ usability scale,” in *Usability evaluation in industry*, CRC Press, 1996, pp. 189–194. [Online]. Available: doi.org/10.1201/9781498710411
[24] N. Pavlova, M. Teychenne, and E. K. Olander, “The Concurrent Acceptability of a Postnatal Walking Group: A Qualitative Study Using the Theoretical Framework of Acceptability,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health*, vol. 17, no. 14, Art. no. 14, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17145027.
[25] “National Health Survey: Health literacy, 2018 | Australian Bureau of Statistics.” Accessed: Aug. 18, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/health/health-conditions-and-risks/national-health-survey-health-literacy/latest-release
[26] J. Sauro, *A practical guide to measuring usability: 72 answers to the most common questions about quantifying the usability of websites and software*. Denver, Colo: Measuring Usability LLC, 2010.
[27] O. Perski and C. E. Short, “Acceptability of digital health interventions: embracing the complexity,” *Transl. Behav. Med.*, vol. 11, no. 7, pp. 1473–1480, May 2021, doi: 10.1093/tbm/ibab048.
[28] M. Sekhon, M. Cartwright, and J. J. Francis, “Development of a theory-informed questionnaire to assess the acceptability of healthcare interventions,” *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, vol. 22, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1186/s12913-022-07577-3.
[29] R. Shedlosky-Shoemaker, A. C. Sturm, M. Saleem, and K. M. Kelly, “Tools for Assessing Readability and Quality of Health-Related Web Sites,” *J. Genet. Couns.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 49–59, 2009, doi: 10.1007/s10897-008-9181-0.
[30] O. Mac, J. Ayre, K. Bell, K. McCaffery, and D. M. Muscat, “Comparison of Readability Scores for Written Health Information Across Formulas Using Automated vs Manual Measures,” *JAMA Netw. Open*, vol. 5, no. 12, p. e2246051, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.46051.
[31] S. J. Shoemaker, M. S. Wolf, and C. Brach, “Development of the Patient Education Materials Assessment Tool (PEMAT): A new measure of understandability and actionability for print and audiovisual patient information,” *Patient Educ. Couns.*, vol. 96, no. 3, pp. 395–403, Sep. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2014.05.027.
[32] M. Dahodwala, R. Geransar, J. Babion, J. de Grood, and P. Sargious, “The impact of the use of video-based educational interventions on patient outcomes in hospital settings: A scoping review,” *Patient Educ. Couns.*, vol. 101, no. 12, pp. 2116–2124, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2018.06.018.

[33] M. M. Perez and M. P. H. Rodgers, “Video and language learning,” *Lang. Learn. J.*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 403–406, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1080/09571736.2019.1629099.
[34] L. van den Heuvel, J. Do, L. Yeates, C. Burns, C. Semsarian, and J. Ingles, “Sudden cardiac death in the young: A qualitative study of experiences of family members with cardiogenetic evaluation,” *J. Genet. Couns.*, vol. n/a, no. n/a, 2023, doi: 10.1002/jgc4.1733.
[35] E. M. Steffen, L. Timotijevic, and A. Coyle, “A qualitative analysis of psychosocial needs and support impacts in families affected by young sudden cardiac death: The role of community and peer support,” *Eur. J. Cardiovasc. Nurs.*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 681–690, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1177/1474515120922347.
[36] L. Yeates, L. Hunt, M. Saleh, C. Semsarian, and J. Ingles, “Poor psychological wellbeing particularly in mothers following sudden cardiac death in the young,” *Eur. J. Cardiovasc. Nurs.*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 484–491, Oct. 2013, doi: 10.1177/1474515113485510.
[37] K. Bates, J. Sweeting, L. Yeates, K. McDonald, C. Semsarian, and J. Ingles, “Psychological adaptation to molecular autopsy findings following sudden cardiac death in the young,” *Genet. Med.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1452–1456, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41436-018-0338-4.
[38] J. Ingles *et al.*, “Health status of cardiac genetic disease patients and their at-risk relatives,” *Int. J. Cardiol.*, vol. 165, no. 3, pp. 448–453, May 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2011.08.083.
[39] M. W. M. Jaspers, T. Steen, C. van den Bos, and M. Geenen, “The think aloud method: a guide to user interface design,” *Int. J. Med. Inf.*, vol. 73, no. 11, pp. 781–795, Nov. 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2004.08.003.

Figure headings

Figure 1. Screenshots from COPE-SCD website showing stylist approach and vector images (A) of text and the interactive menu (B) with roll over feature shown by the purple arrow.

Figure 2 – Screenshots of the website and illustrative quotes from the think aloud analysis highlighting the various opinions of the participants. On the left is the original layout using stock images, on the right is the final layout using vector images.

Table headings

Table 1 – Theoretical framework of acceptability [14].

Table 2 – Menu of the COPE-SCD website (www.copescd.org.au) with Flesch-Kincaid grade level of each subpage. NA = not assessed

Table 3 – Think Aloud Participant Demographics.

Table 4 – Illustrative quotes mapped to the seven constructs of acceptability [14] from the think aloud analysis.

Tables

Table 1 – Theoretical framework of acceptability [14]

Construct	**Definition**
Affective attitude	How an individual feels about an intervention
Burden	The perceived amount of effort that is required to participate in the intervention
Ethicality	The extent to which the intervention has a good fit with an individual's value system
Intervention coherence	The extent to which the participant understands the intervention and how it works
Opportunity costs	The extent to which benefits, profits or values must be given to engage with the intervention
Perceived effectiveness	The extent to which the intervention is perceived as likely to achieve its purpose
Self-efficacy	The participants confidence that they can perform the behaviours required to participate in the intervention

Table 2 – Menu of the COPE-SCD website (www.copescd.org.au) with Flesch-Kincaid grade level of each subpage. NA = not assessed

Menu	**Submenu**	**Flesch-Kincaid grade level**
Home page	General information & 'about us'	9.4
Sudden cardiac death	What is sudden cardiac death	9.7
	After the death (coronial process)	8.7
	Genetic causes of sudden cardiac death	9.4
	Genetic testing	9.9
Grief and loss	Grief and loss	9.5
	Coping strategies	6.7
	Support for grieving family and friends	8.1
	How to get help	8.9
	Unanswered questions	7.1
Family stories	A place for families to tell their story	NA
Group Support	Information on the online support sessions	8.9
Contact us	Contact information	NA
	List of Genetic Heart Disease Clinics in Australia and New Zealand	NA

Table 3 – Think Aloud Participant Demographics.

Characteristic (n = 6)	**n (%)**
Median time since death (range): 3years (1-5years)*	
Median age: 39.5 (29-62) years	
Female	3 (50)
University educated	6 (100)
Religious Affiliation	
No religion	3 (50)
Religious	3 (50)
Marital status	
Married	4 (67)
Widowed	2 (33)
Country of birth	
Australia	4 (67)
Outside of Australia	2 (33)
Ethnicity	
European	5 (83)
Non-European	1 (17)
Socioeconomic indexes for area	
Top 50% IRSAD areas	5 (83)
Top 50% IEO areas	5 (83)
Remoteness area	
Major cities of Australia	4 (67)
Inner regional Australia	2 (33)
Other medical conditions	4 (67)**
*One family had two deaths, most recent included	
** One participant had a diagnosis of depression	

Abbreviations: IRSAD = index of relative socioeconomic advantage and disadvantage, IEO = index of education and occupation

Table 4 – Illustrative quotes mapped to the seven constructs of acceptability [14] from the think aloud analysis

Acceptability construct	Affective attitude	Burden	Ethicality	Opportunity costs	Intervention coherence	Perceived effectiveness	Self-efficacy
Construct description	*How an individual feels about the intervention*	*The perceived amount of effort that his required to participate*	*The extent to which the intervention has a good fit with an individual's value system*	*The extent to which benefits, profits or values must be given up to engage in the intervention*	*The extent to which the participant understands the intervention and how it works*	*The extent to which the intervention is perceived as likely to achieve its purpose*	*The participants confidence that they can perform the behavior(s) required*
Illustrative quotes	"having sort of one place to go for all the information is really good" Participant 1 "I think some of the pictures, uh, yeah, like having muted dark tones when talking about grief, it's, it's a bit of a controversial topic because people are feeling that and they relate to that, but at the same time, you don't want to reinforce that." Participant 3	"I think that most of the information is presented in a fairly easily accessible way" Participant 3 "a good balance. Um, and it made me feel, well, I guess I'm, you know, almost three years down the track, but, um, yeah. Acknowledged, yeah, my own journey and feelings" Participant 6	"There was nothing there that kind of, I found offensive or, unduly upsetting. Uh, I think it's, uh, you know, I'm revisiting lots of elements that are perhaps kind of pushed aside for a long period of time" Participant 2 "A lot of the stuff on cardiac death is always hard to read, but not because of the content, just because of what's happened". Participant 5	"It would be a very good use of my time." Participant 3 "I think it's helpful. I think it sort of helps follow up a little bit what we did in the online sessions by reflecting on um, the things we discussed". Participant 5	"Something like this early on, it'd be helpful for me, um, to answer some of those questions, those common questions, but then also to share it say on social media, on Facebook and say, you know, I have found this really helpful" Participant 6	"Yeah, I think so... it… captures quite a few aspects of fears for your own, like mortality in family as well as, um, how do we get through this, like two of the big questions that come up, when something like this happens, I think. And just feeling quite alone in it, and wanting to understand, just confused by what on earth went on. I think it, it catches a few of those really big feelings and questions that you have in this situation". Participant 5	"it's ease of navigation. It was simple." Participant 4

Figure 1

A

B



(roll over)



Figure 2



"I like the ocean and stuff. I think that's a nice, um, touch… Um, totally polarized and really silly, but does pink maybe not talk to everybody? Participant 1

"This one I really like. I'm just not sure it's got to do with diving into the ocean perhaps. I don't know, perhaps someone diving into something like that might be, I dunno, a nice image to use somewhere where you don't want to go" Participant 2



"I think it [hands image] probably conveys what you're trying to show too, that like you wanna hand to hold or like, like a bit of a connection with somebody else in, in the grief and aftermath of it." Participant 5